

Remarks/Arguments

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants amended Claims 7 and 8 to correct antecedent basis by removing “first” with respect to a shield recited in Claims 7 and 8.

The Rejection of Claims 8-11 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected Claims 8-11, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended Claims 8-11 to address the items cited by the Examiner in Claims 8-11.

Applicants courteously request that the rejection be removed.

The Rejection of Claims 5-7 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,713,208 (Doyle). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Anticipation requires that all of the elements of the claim be taught within the four corners of a single reference.

The second portion of Doyle does not guide the wire during winding

Claim 5 has been amended to recite the second portion of the shroud guiding the wire during winding: “wherein first and second portions of said shroud guide a wire during a winding of said wire about said pole and said second portion of said shroud directly guides said wire on said hook to terminate said wire onto said hook.” The guiding function of the second portion during winding is clearly shown in the figures and written description of the instant application. For example, Figures 3 and 3A show the second portion of shroud 15 guiding the wire unto hook 4 after the wire has been wound around the pole. Figure 2 shows the second portion guiding wire 11 during winding of the wire about pole 6.

The Examiner has cited element 58 of Doyle as being analogous to the second portion recited in Claim 5. However, element 58 does not guide the wire during winding of the wire about a pole. Element 58 is a hooking plate, which is well known in the art to be used only for the termination of a wire and which is not used to guide the wire during winding. For example, Figure 1 of Doyle clearly shows that element 58 is held well away from the wire during the winding of the wire about the pole. In the position shown in Figure 1, the wire cannot contact element 58. In fact, it is necessary for element 58 to remain out of the path of the wire during the pole winding process. That is, element 58 would interfere with the pole winding process if element 58 were to contact the wire during the winding process.

Doyle describes the operation of element 58 in col. 6, lines 5-46. In particular, lines 17-26 describe how the element is kept remote from the commutator and then pivoted to cover the hooks after shield 52 is withdrawn. There is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation regarding element 58 guiding the wire during the winding of the wire about a pole.

Doyle does not teach all the elements of Claim 5. Therefore, Claim 5 is novel with respect to Doyle. Claims 6 and 7, dependent from Claim 5, enjoy the same distinction with respect to Doyle.

Applicants courteously request that the rejection be removed.

Attorney Docket No.: ATOP: 108US
U.S. Patent Application No. 10/631,099
Reply to Office Action of December 12, 2006
Date: March 12, 2007

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/C. Paul Maliszewski/
C. Paul Maliszewski
Registration No. 51,990
Simpson & Simpson, PLLC
5555 Main Street
Williamsville, NY 14221-5406
Telephone No. 716-626-1564

CPM/
Dated: March 12, 2007